

Remarks

The appeal is withdrawn. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 21-26 are now pending.

Rejections Based On Sasaki

Claims 1, 3 and 7 stand rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Sasaki (5228118). Claim 8 stands rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sasaki.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the rendering module includes rendering functionality for the printer and information about the printer. Support for this amendment to Claim 1 is found in the Specification at page 6, line 27 through page 7, line 4.

Sasaki teaches an "ID Data Output control program" residing on a laser printer LP. The control program sends "interpreter-identification data" to a personal computer PC. The interpreter-identification data identifies to the PC which of two Language Interpreters (A or B) the printer uses for interpreting printing control languages. The computer uses this identification data to select the appropriate printer driver. Sasaki, column 5, lines 32-43 and column 7, lines 44-53.

At most, Sasaki suggests only that the printer sends information about itself (i.e., which language interpreter the printer uses) to the computer. Sasaki does not teach or suggest that the printer also sends rendering functionality to the computer. Hence, Sasaki does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 1 as amended. Claims 2-3 and 5-8 also distinguish over Sasaki due to their dependence on Claim 1.

Rejections Based On Yu

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Yu (6707568). Claims 5-6 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Yu in view of Saito (6523696).

In support of the rejections, the Office asserts that filter 20 in Yu is a rendering module disposed in a peripheral device. This assertion is not correct. Filter 20 in Yu resides on computer 2 (the host device) along with printer driver 12, not on printer 6. Yu, Figs. 3A and 3B. Hence, even if it is assumed filter 20 might somehow be deemed to be the claimed rendering module, it is not disposed on the printer as recited in amended Claim 1. In addition, amended Claim 1 recites that the rendering module includes rendering functionality for the printer and information

about the printer. There is no teaching in Yu that filter 20 includes either rendering functionality for the printer or information about the printer. For this additional reason, therefore, Claim 1 as amended distinguishes over Yu. Claims 2-3 and 5-8 also distinguish over Yu due to their dependence on Claim 1.

New Claims 21-26

New Claim 21 is directed to a printing system comprising:

a host module for initiating a communication from a host device, said host module having a first program; and

a rendering module disposed in a printer, said rendering module including a second program for displaying and manipulating text, images and/or other graphics and said rendering module being provided to said host device in response to said communication, said first program and said second program used cooperatively to control said printer.

New Claim 25 is a method counterpart to the system of Claim 21 and contains similar limitations.

Neither Sasaki nor Yu teach this combination of elements. For example, neither Sasaki nor Yu teach a rendering module disposed in a printer that includes programming for displaying and manipulating text, images and/or other graphics and providing the rendering module to a host device to help control the printer.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,974
(208) 433-1991 x204